

CITY OF LEWISTON
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES for January 25, 2016

- I. **ROLL CALL:** The meeting was held in the City Council Chambers on the first floor of City Hall and was called to order at 5:30 p.m. Chairperson, Bruce Damon, chaired the meeting.

Members in Attendance: Bruce Damon, Walter Hill, Normand Ancil, Paul Madore, Pauline Gudas and Michael Marcotte

Members Absent: Sandra Marquis

Associate Member Present: Sonia Taylor and Zachary Pettengill

Sonia Taylor was appointed full voting member for this meeting.

Staff Present: David Hediger, City Planner and Gil Arsenault, Director of Planning and Code Enforcement

- II. **ADJUSTMENT TO THE AGENDA:** None

- III. **CORRESPONDENCE:** Memo dated 1/25/2016 from David Hediger to Planning Board; letter dated 1/25/2016 from Stoneybrook Consultants to David Hediger; memo from Ryan Barnes, Lewiston Public Works to David Hediger dated 1/22/2016.

- IV. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

An application submitted by Stoneybrook Consultants, Inc. on behalf of M & B, LLC to establish a seven lot subdivision for single family homes on land at 4 Matobian Lane and 504 Pond Road with access from an extension of Matobian Lane.

David summarized memo and conditions resolved on January 25, 2016. Mike Gotto provided a summary of the project, showing existing and proposed lots and the ability for future development. David noted staff's recommended conditions of approval and is comfortable in recommending approval. It was noted that the road will be accepted by the City. Concerns exist with activity next to the wetlands. Mike Gotto referenced vernal pool regulations and they are requesting a DEP permit-by-rule. Bruce had questions about declaration of covenant documents, typo's, missing sections, etc. and David explained at a minimum the covenants need to speak to maintenance of stormwater pond and open space. Bruce asked about enforcement and maintenance of storm water ponds. David explained City's role and Mike Gotto explained third parties role in inspection of southwest ponds. They also discussed role of homeowners association.

Normand asked about ability to connect dead end road and make a through street. Mike Gotto said environmental constraints will likely limit a thru-street; maybe it could be a loop.

Walter asked about the responsibilities of the association and who will be responsible. Mike Gotto noted it will be the developer until a percentage of lots are sold and that will be determine prior to recording.

Paul Madore spoke to past association challenges in Lewiston but the conditions for the responsibility of the stormwater pond seem clear. He asked for clarification on maintenance of vernal pools and storm water ponds and Mike Gotto provided clarification on the difference between the two.

Bruce asked about 200' diameter circle shown on each lot and David explained the irregular lot requirements. Bruce noted concerns that property owners end up filling in wetlands after approval.

Pauline expressed frustration with the project being rushed, the number of unresolved issues and thought that maybe this project should be continued until issues are resolved.

The following motion was made:

MOTION: by **Pauline Gudas** to continue this item until the February 8, 2016 meeting. Second by **Walter Hill**.

Discussion followed.

Michael Marcotte asked about \$275,000 estimated cost of construction and Mike Gotto noted that the value is based upon bids. He said the road will be constructed in 3 – 4 months but he was unsure of when the lots will sell.

Mike Gotto was embarrassed by number of conditions, but feels they can be addressed. David explained street acceptance process. Michael Marcotte expressed concerns about a road being accepted and City costs to maintain with no houses developed. Sonia asked about the value of lots and City's return. David said it will vary but Public Works will tell you this road will cost money to maintain; not sure what the breakeven point is. David also explained public/private street standards.

Walter noted concerns with incomplete association documents.

Gil spoke to the development costs, underground utilities no longer being required, and staff was trying to accommodate new development.

Paul asked if staff was pressured to schedule the project. David noted he preferred not to have all these conditions and typically would not have scheduled, but he is comfortable recommending approval with conditions.

Paul remained supportive of the project. Pauline wants issues addressed prior to approving because she felt activity will not occur in the coming weeks. Bruce noted associate members, voting or not may contribute to the discussion. Zachary admitted plans seemed a bit messy, but conditions should address this. Michael Marcotte noted underground utilities would add value to the project. He

noted the incomplete association documents and questioned if a project delay of two weeks would impact the project. David explained it may result in fewer conditions and he explained City's review process.

Bruce asked if neighbors were notified and David said yes. Bruce asked about DEP limitation and David and Mike Gotto noted limits of activity until DEP approval is obtained.

Ron Leblanc, representative for applicant Rick Lachapelle noted the site contractor is ready and waiting for approval.

VOTED: 4-3 (Passed)
Sonia Taylor, Paul Madore and Normand Anctil opposed

7:10 p.m. – Board took a ten minute recess. Resumed meeting at 7:20 p.m.

V. OTHER BUSINESS:

a) Review of FY2017 LCIP

The Board began its review of the LCIP and requested clarification on the following items:

Airport:

- P.14: If Auburn doesn't pay, will project still occur?
- P.17: Is this accurate amount? 8,000 hours is not a lot for a 1990 model.
- P.18: Need more information; don't we already have a hanger operating at a loss? Board does not seem interested in supporting this. What's the airport bond's role in approving private lender funding?

LA 911

- P.23: Funding relationship with Auburn; how does this work and what if one of the communities does not contribute? How does the three-year implementation occur? NOTE: overall, the question of funding involving a number of projects where both communities are listed as sources was questioned if one of the communities does not contribute).

LATC/Bus

- P.25: What type of buses are being purchased, large or smaller buses; has fuel efficient, capacity been considered?

Acquisition/Demolition

- P.28: Current balance for demolition? What did we ask for last year and what was funded?

Lewiston Steam Substation

- P.29: What is the time schedule? Is the first quarter 2017 realistic for completion of the new substation? What was the acquisition costs involved with this?

Riverfront Implementation

- P.30: Typos with respect to Funding Source columns?
Questions/concerns about the bridge design and importance of aesthetics and the need to get PB and HPRB approval.

Oxford Street Parking Lot

- P.32: Questions regarding use of CDBG funding of \$28,000 as there was no demo funds last year in CDBG

Fire Department

- P.36: See Fire Substation Study, P.42
P.37: Clarification of trucks proposed; average \$50,000 when \$30,000 trade is accounted for; Lewiston Public Works gets better prices; why?

Chestnut Street Parking Garage

- P.39: This should be operating budget item; and how long would it be bonded for; longer than the life of the asset. Typo in justification: \$5 per square foot.

Parking Study and Meters

- P.40: What is the life expectancy of meters tied to bond amount and length? Why do we need a study?

Fire Substation Study

- P.42: Why do a study? How does this relate to P.36? Why is this being bonded?

City Building Security

- P.43: Is this enough funding for City Hall improvements?

Main Street Fire Station

- P.46: Is the amount \$600,000 or \$650,000 (and summary sheet)? How does this relate to other fire requests one pages 36 and 42?

The Board stopped at P.60

Board agreed to meet on February 1, 2016 to continue their review of the LCIP.

- b) Any other business Planning Board Members may have relating to the duties of the Lewiston Planning Board. None

VI. READING OF MINUTES: Adoption of the January 11, 2016 draft minutes.

The January 11, 2016 draft meeting minutes will be adopted at the February 8, 2016 meeting.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT:** The following motion was made to adjourn.

MOTION: by **Pauline Gudas** that this meeting adjourns at 8:55 p.m. Second
by **Paul Madore**.

VOTED: 7-0 (Passed)

The next regularly scheduled meeting is for Monday, February 8, 2016 at
5:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Michael Marcotte
CLL

Michael Marcotte, Secretary